

THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE:

WHAT IT IMPORTS.

BY

REV. SAMUEL SIMMS,

LOUGHBRICKLAND.

“The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means ; and my people love *to have it so* : and what will ye do in the end thereof.”—JER. v. 31.

(SECOND EDITION—SECOND THOUSAND.)

BELFAST:

PRINTED BY W. & G. BAIRD, 10 & 12, ARTHUR STREET.

1877.

THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE:

WHAT IT IMPORTS.

WHAT the Oath of Allegiance to the British Crown and Constitution really imports has of late years become a subject of keen controversy and debate. In order, if possible, to cast some light on a subject of such importance, let us inquire, in the first place, what

THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION

really is. As regards the outward framework, or machinery, so to speak, of the Constitution, there can be no dispute. The three estates of the British realm are the Sovereign, the Lords, and the Commons. The Constitution is not a pure monarchy, a pure aristocracy, or a pure democracy, but a compound of all three. The office of Sovereign is hereditary, and the chief branches of the Royal prerogative are:—The Sovereign alone can make war or peace; he alone can pardon those who break the laws; he alone can prorogue, dissolve, or call a Parliament; he can prevent a law from passing by refusing to sign it; no money can be coined but by his command; and all ranks of nobility are created by him. Two kinds of Lords sit in the Upper House—Lords Spiritual and Lords Temporal. There are thirty Lords Spiritual; but the number of Lords Temporal is unsettled, and can be increased by the Sovereign. There are 654 members in the House of Commons. England and Wales are represented by 489, Scotland by 60, and Ireland by 105. The Commons command all the supplies, and thus can effectually control the Sovereign. Any member in either House of Parliament may propose a law, which is called bringing in a Bill; but every Bill must be read and passed by a majority of votes three times in each House before it can be laid before the Sovereign for signature.

The administration of British law is founded on three great principles—the Jury, the Habeas Corpus Act, and the independence of the Judges. In England and Ireland a Grand Jury sit to judge whether the case is fit to go to trial ; then a second Jury of twelve decide upon the case, and must be unanimous in their verdict of guilty or not guilty. In Scotland there is no Grand Jury: a Jury of fifteen try the case, and return a verdict of guilty, not guilty, or not proven, by a majority of votes.

There are various Courts in which the Statute Law, the Common Law, and the Law of Equity are administered. Statute Law is that embodied in Acts of Parliament. Common Law is the law of old custom, and depends on the decision of former cases. The Law of Equity applies to those cases in which the Sovereign interferes, through the Lord Chancellor, to prevent injustice arising from the Common Law. The principal English and Irish Courts are those of Chancery, Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer. In Scotland the Court of Session and the High Court of Justiciary are the chief tribunals.

So much for what we may call the outward framework, or machinery, of the Constitution. Now, any person of ordinary intelligence will at once perceive that we have in the above machinery many excellent things. In connection with the British Constitution we have the forms of liberty, such as self-government, or government by representation. These forms of liberty can be traced as far back as the Saxon Witenagemot, or Parliament ; and these forms were brought forward more prominently by the doings of the Long Parliament and the Westminster Assembly, and also by the sharp swords of the Scotch Covenanting Army and the renowned Ironsides of Cromwell. We have also in this country hereditary limited monarchy, which is allowed by the generality of writers to be an excellent, if not the very best, form of Government.

We have thus undoubtedly several good things in connection with the British Constitution ; but let the reader please

observe that, whilst I have repeatedly used the phrase *in connection with*, I have not once employed the preposition *in*. In fact, the distinction which I make between the phrase *in connection with* and the proposition *in* constitutes the key-note of this pamphlet. My proposition is, that whilst there are many good things *in connection with* the British Constitution, yet, at the same time, there is not *in* the CONSTITUTION ITSELF, AS ESTABLISHED BY LAW,—at least in its ecclesiastical arrangements,—a single good thing—no, not one. For what is the British Constitution, as now established by law? It is neither more nor less than THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY, INCLUDING THE ACT RESCISSORY, MODIFIED IN A CERTAIN WAY BY THE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT AND THE TOLERATION ACT. The Act of Uniformity stands as firmly this day in the Statute-book as it did in 1662. In fact, the Act of Uniformity alone *was* the Constitution up till 1689. Hence, the Rev. Thomas M'Crie, D.D., in his St. Bartholomew Bicentenary Lecture, writes thus:—"The Act of Uniformity, which expelled the Nonconformists of 1662, still stands in force repealing the Nonconformists of the present day. Is it to stand for ever? Is it to go crushing down or squeezing out, as it has done for two centuries, the conscience and piety of the Church? Or will the nation bear much longer with a Statute which, while inexorable in ceremonials, converts this very uniformity into an ample shield of toleration for all sorts of varieties in doctrinal teaching?" Another writer uses the following language:—"The Act of Uniformity still remains unchanged. It has found most zealous defenders, and also met with not less emphatic condemnation from persons connected with the Anglican Church. One Anglican writer condemns it as 'that most disastrous, most tyrannical, and most schismatical Act of Uniformity.' To attempt any change or repeal of this Act would shake the Church of England to its very foundations, for this Act is its Magna Charta, its chief political support as the State Church."

Now, the Act of Uniformity was one of the most cruel, wicked, and treacherous Acts of which we read in all history.

It evicted from their parishes two thousand Protestant ministers in England to perish in the snows of Winter, and that, too, after the most deceitful manœuvring, so as to deprive those ministers of a year's salary. It drove from Worthenbury the "heavenly Philip Henry," hanged Barrow and Greenwood, burned to ashes Elizabeth Gaunt, all but murdered the immortal Richard Baxter, banished Roger Williams from his beloved Salem, and sent thousands of others to the wilds of America to "herd with the panther." In Scotland the Act of Uniformity banished from their livings four hundred Presbyterian ministers. It cut out the big, manly heart from the noble Hackston; it drowned the youthful Margaret Wilson in the waters of the Solway—of whom the sexton of Wigtown Churchyard, as he showed her grave, was accustomed to say, "She was but a lassie; and yet she died for the Covenant"—and, in one word, it "hunted down like wild beasts, tortured till their bones were beaten flat, imprisoned by hundreds, hanged by scores," thousands of men and women of whom the world was not worthy!"

Now, who except a full-blown Ritualist, an Ultramontane Papist, or a downright *Torquemada*, would ever for one moment dream of calling the Act of Uniformity "a glorious Constitution?" Was it not, in the language of the Anglican just quoted, "a most disastrous, most tyrannical, and most schismatical Act?" Did not this Act cover Scotland for twenty-six long years with a pall of gloom, sorrow, and tears as great, dark, and deep as any that ever fell upon a people since the ten Roman persecutions? Did it not turn England into a Bochim and make Scotland a field of blood? How, then, can any man have the enormous audacity to stand up in the pulpit or on the platform and speak of the British Constitution, which includes the Act of Uniformity, as "a glorious Constitution?" On the contrary, I assert that it is an inglorious Constitution, an immoral Constitution, an anti-Scriptural, Erastian, and semi-Popish Constitution,—yea, an anti-Christian and blasphemous Constitution, for it dethrones the Saviour and sets a mortal in His stead!

“But,” says my Presbyterian or Nonconformist friend, “I do not approve of the Act of Uniformity; but the Act of Uniformity Constitution was made *all right* at THE REVOLUTION SETTLEMENT.” Let us see how the Revolution made the Act of Uniformity *all right*. The first thing the Revolution Settlement did was to sink into oblivion the whole work of the Covenanted Reformation; the painful legislation of ten years—legislation which in its spirit and tendency approached nearer to that of the reforming days of Judah and Israel than any the world has ever witnessed. The next thing the Revolution settlement did was to *continue* in its undiminished force the Act of Uniformity in England. The next thing the Revolution Settlement did was to establish Presbyterianism in Scotland on an unscriptural and Erastian basis. The history of the last two hundred years clearly shows that the Revolution Church of Scotland has always been a bond slave to the State—bound hand and foot to the throne of iniquity. She has expelled from her pale almost every man of high religious principle who has ever been connected with her, from M'Millan to Chalmers. She has complacently received ministers forced into her pulpits by Erastian hands, and she has allowed without a murmur tyranny to take away the sun and blot out the stars of Scotland's ancient Covenanted glories.

And with what a shout of triumph has she received from the hands of a Tory Ministry the right or permission to choose her own ministers! But was there anything in the recent Act of the Tory Ministry, with regard to the Revolution Church of Scotland, which was at all calculated to call forth shouts of joy? Certainly not. The Sovereign of Great Britain is by law the supreme head of the Church of England, but the real, acting supreme head is the Prime Minister. Now, this real, acting supreme head may be, as to religious views and moral character, almost anything at all. He may be a man who has never been heard to utter a noble sentiment, nor to advocate anything for the real good of the people. He may be a trickster, who, after opposing a

measure for years, may suddenly pass that very measure for a mere selfish purpose. He may be a political tight-rope dancer, lying merely at the catch, always aiming at the cross-bar of post, pension, and preferment ; and yet by law he is the supreme head, under Christ, of the Church of England ! Now, this supreme head comes forward to the Church of Scotland and, in effect, says :—" Hereditary bondswoman of Erastian tyranny, the State has not allowed you the slightest liberty, as far as choosing your ministers is concerned, for above two hundred years, during all which time you have been shut up in the bastille of patronage ! Rather than yield one iota to your demands, the State allowed you to be rent in twain. But now we are anxious to counteract the Free Church, to buttress up the Prelatic Church of England, and, above all, to 'dish the Whigs.' You will, therefore, please allow us to take the galling chain from off your neck for a little. You know that we are all Erastians to the 'back bone,' and you know quite well that we don't care one twopenny ticket for the rights of the Christian people ; but in order that we, the Tory Ministry, may gain some advantage, you will please be so complacent as to accept of our gift. But bear in mind that you are expected to vote hard for the Tories, for if you do not, we do not pledge ourselves that we will not take back again our gift."

And is *this* the act which Professor Porter, of the Assembly's College, Belfast, attempted to glorify at the recent meeting of the so-called "Constitutional Tenant-right Association," held at Ballyclare ? Is Dr. Porter an Erastian ? If he is so, then I fancy that he is not a very fit person to guide in the way they should go the future ministry of the Presbyterian Church. If he is not an Erastian, then clearly he has been throwing dust in the eyes of the Presbyterian tenant-farmers of Ballyclare !

"You say, then," says my Presbyterian or Nonconformist friend, "that you can find nothing good either in the Act of Uniformity or in the Revolution Settlement ; but surely you cannot say the same of the TOLERATION ACT ?" In reply to

this question, I would observe that, when properly understood, tolerance and toleration are good things. With regard to the Revolution of 1688, I believe that it was a merciful interposition of Divine Providence—an interposition, however, which the nation did not improve as it ought. The work of the Covenanted Reformation was not restored, and the Act of Uniformity was allowed to remain on the Statute book. Now, had the Act of Uniformity been repealed at the Revolution, as it ought to have been, there would then have been no necessity for a Toleration Act. Our English dictionaries tell us that toleration means “allowance given to that which is not approved.” Now, the Act of Uniformity does not *approve* of giving liberty to Christian men to serve God according to the light of their consciences and the directions of the Divine Word. On the contrary, it declares that the penalty for the fourth offence against “the Conventicle Act”—that is, for persons attending meetings for religious worship other than those of the Established Church of England—is DEATH!! Now, the Toleration Act does nothing more nor less than put a chain on the monstrous wild beast of the Act of Uniformity. It gives no legal, positive right or *status* to any denomination in the Three Kingdoms but to the Established Churches of England and Scotland; and hence Lord Deas declares that “there is no jurisdiction recognised by the law except that which flows from the State.” What fearful and fatal delusion, therefore, is it for men to shout out, from platform and pulpit, “Glorious Constitution—glorious Toleration Act!” Lord Macaulay, when treating of the Toleration Act, says that, although it was absurd in theory, yet in practice it had wrought very well. Wrought very well, indeed! What should we think of a man who would take a mad dog into a town and chain the dog to a post, and then call upon the inhabitants to come and rejoice over the *chain*? And what should we think if all the inhabitants of the town were to come forward to the mad dog and shout aloud, like Diana’s worshippers at Ephesus, for “the space of two hours”—“O,

glorious, glorious mad dog! O, most glorious, glorious *chain!*" What would a good old Cameronian say and do were he to witness such a scene? Why, of course he could say nothing else but—"O, fools and madmen! Bring me a rifle, and I will soon settle the question *anent* the mad dog and the chain." He would then blow the brains out of the mad dog, and say—"Now, take the chain to some marine store and sell it as old iron." The Toleration Act was simply a HUGE POPISH INDULGENCE, a blasphemous assumption of the attributes of the Almighty. What right has any State on earth to say to Christian men that it will *permit* them to obey the Commandments of Christ? Is it not as clear as a sunbeam that, if we accept the permission of civil rulers to obey Christ, we thereby acknowledge a right on the part of such rulers to command us to disobey Christ? Did Paul or Peter, or James or John, ever go, cap in hand, to ask leave from the Roman Cæsar to preach the Gospel within the bounds of the Roman Empire? Certainly not. What right, then, had the British nation, at the time of the Revolution Settlement, to bow down in the dust of such an immeasurable degradation as to ask liberty for ministers of the Gospel to teach and preach, and even to live?

But there is another thing in connection with the Toleration Act that we must not overlook, and that is that this Act does not come into operation, as regards an individual, *until* the Oath of Allegiance is sworn. The Act of Toleration liberated the great body of Dissenters from all penal statutes, with references to the exercise of their religion, *on condition of their taking the Oath of Allegiance*. The import of the phrase *on condition* simply is, that as soon as a person expresses his approval of and his determination to support, the Act of Uniformity, the Revolution Settlement, and the Act of Toleration, then he will not be exposed to the terrible penalties decreed in the Act of Uniformity against all who worship God according to the light of conscience and the teachings of the Divine Word. But there is even more than this implied in swearing the Oath of

Allegiance. The person who takes the oath must swear, at least indirectly, that the Covenanted Reformation was an act of rebellion ; the Covenants, National and Solemn League, treasonable bonds ; that the martyrs died as fools die ; and above all, that the headship of Christ is a fabulous myth. To Presbyterian and Protestant Nonconformists the Act of Uniformity speaks thus :—"You restless, rebellious Dissenters, you know how I treated your fathers in the past. I banished them to the pestilential plantations, to 'herd with the panther;' I hunted them down 'like wild beasts;' I tortured them till their 'bones were beaten flat;' I 'imprisoned them by hundreds and hanged them by scores'—yes, and what is more, you know that I would do the same to-morrow were I allowed freely to act." On the other hand, the Toleration Act, as a sort of decoy-duck for the Act of Uniformity, as the siren that sings its songs, speaks thus to Dissenters :—"Come forward, my friends ; don't be afraid ; enter into the rich and luxuriantly-furnished chambers of the 'British Constitution.' I'll not allow the Act of Uniformity to lay a single finger upon you. Please don't be afraid ; step in, step in." Now really, were not the thing so terribly serious, who on earth could avoid laughing at the thought of any man, and much more of a minister of the Gospel, calling that a "glorious" Constitution which has actually to be chained up, like a horrible mad bull, lest it should turn round and tear the entrails out of the very man who, in the depths of an unspeakable degradation, bows down to swear to it or to swear by ? I read in classic fable of a celebrated dog with three heads, whose name was Cerberus, and this dog was supposed to be the watch-dog of hell. Now, I may be of obtuse intellect ; but I must acknowledge that I do not well see how any casuist, in calculating the difference between swearing to or by Cerberus and swearing to or by the Act of Uniformity, could arrive at any very satisfactory conclusion.

Mere selfish, time-serving sycophants, and even multitudes of good and godly men who have never really studied

the subject, may attempt to varnish over the iniquities of the British Constitution; but I fearlessly assert that the British Constitution is still one of the Constitutions of the "ten-horned beast" (see Apocalypse, chapter xiii.). I am quite aware that multitudes hold and teach that England ceased to be a "horn of the beast" at the time when Henry VIII. began his quarrel with the Pope, but I am fully persuaded that this is an entire mistake. No doubt, many most important results as regards Protestantism followed from the quarrel alluded to; but most undoubtedly that quarrel did not lead to the purging of the Constitution from the leaven of Popery. By his "Bloody Statute" Henry VIII. burned Protestants and Papists alike; and it is quite certain that he both lived and died a Papist. Almost as well might we say that England ceased to be a horn of the beast when William of Normandy seized the British sceptre, for no sooner was that remarkable man seated upon the throne of England than he commenced a conflict with the Papacy, which never ended till the Reformation. When he found himself securely seated on the throne, William the Conqueror filled the English dioceses with bishops of his own nomination, and he took upon himself the authority which the Pope had hitherto claimed—that is, of nominating to all vacant ecclesiastical offices—and he required all the priests to swear obedience to himself, and he demanded that all the decrees of Synods should be countersigned by himself. This bold attitude did the Conqueror assume even when the "Chair of St. Peter" was occupied by the haughty Hildebrand. Yet who would ever dream of saying that England ceased to be a horn of the beast during the reign of William the Conqueror?

And then as to the first and second Reformations, I must confess that I rather incline to the opinion that, even by those noble attempts to set up a Constitution on Scriptural principles, the great beast with the iron teeth was not wholly expelled from the nation. The first Reformation was very soon so encroached upon by kingly tyranny that a second

Reformation became an absolute necessity, and the marks of the spotted "leopard," the grisly "bear," and the ferocious "lion" seemed to have been so deeply traced upon the whole framework of society that even the glorious second Reformation did not entirely remove them. How else can we account for the national acquiescence in the barbarities of Charles II. ? But let me not be misunderstood. I do most freely grant that, as far as sound Scripture doctrine, national covenanting, and perhaps even civil legislation, could go, the beast actually was for a time driven from the land ; but, while I make this concession, am I not shut up by my very concession to assert that the beast returned with sevenfold violence at the restoration of Charles II. ? The poor Covenanters, in their laudable anxiety to have not only a Scriptural Church, but also a Scriptural Commonwealth, had the great misfortune to set upon the throne the greatest "beast"—with the exception of Nero, perhaps—that ever ruled over any nation.

That we may perceive distinctly the thoroughly beastly character of the Constitution as by law established, let us observe its horrible cruelty to the man whose conscientious convictions will not allow him to swear to it as it is. The British Constitution has horns "like a lamb," but it speaks "as a dragon." Let us suppose the case of a man who is an excellent member of society, a friend to good government, a lover of whatever is calculated to promote the well-being of his fellow-man ; yet, because this good individual cannot homologate the evils of the Constitution, how does the Constitution treat him ? Why, it puts him, so to speak, to "the ban of the Empire." Such a man appeals first, let us suppose, to the Act of Uniformity, and what does the Act of Uniformity say ? It says—"You need not appeal to me, sir ; for if I can get a few Popish or other lawyers to discover a flaw in some of the links of the chain of the Toleration Act, then I will slit up your nostrils, cut off your nose, grub out your ears, and brand you on the breast with a red-hot iron until your skin and flesh shall shrivel up like a 'winter'

leaf, and the very bone shall shrink, heave, and crackle from beneath!" "Oh, horrible!" says the poor victim of tyranny. He then appeals to the Revolution Settlement, and the Revolution Settlement says—"You need not appeal to me, sir, for I'm just the Act of Uniformity crushed up into a corner, *compelled*, sadly against my will, to allow the Scottish people to set up Presbyterianism after an Erastian fashion." "Oh, most horrible!" says the poor victim. He then flies to the Toleration Act, and this Act says—"I'll not speak one word to you, sir, till you bow down and pay me due obeisance. Till you swear to me and to the Act of Uniformity, and also to the Revolution Settlement, you are not tolerated at all?" "But if you please, Toleration Act," says the poor victim, "I don't want to be tolerated. I want to be *free*—*free* as the Kaffirs or Hottentots at the Cape of Good Hope—*free* as the aborigines of Australia—*free* as the red man in the far-distant prairies of the West, who can read his Bible or hearken to the missionary at his will, without being *blessed* with any fine Toleration Act! I want to be *free*—*free* as the zephyr that kisses the violet—*free* as the eagle that soars the Alps—*free* as God and Nature intended that I should be! And I tell you, Toleration Act, that I never, never shall receive permission from man to obey the commands of Jesus Christ!" "Very well," says the Toleration Act; "I now set a mark upon you, so that anyone who sees you may slay you." I know that God and public opinion may tolerate such a man, but the Constitution tolerates him not. The Spanish Inquisition cried out, "Receive the Popish religion, or death!" the infidels of France cried out, "Liberty, equality, and fraternity, or death!" and the British Constitution cries out, "Submit to be tolerated, or death!"—no, not exactly *death*, perhaps. How far a man might suffer for refusing to be tolerated—that is, for refusing to take the Oath of Allegiance—I know not. In some very extreme case it might, perhaps, even be death; but if Popery should obtain hold of the Constitution, the Oath perhaps will, in that case, be quite unnecessary—**DEATH** it must assuredly would be!

Sir Walter Scott, in one of his novels, has given us a most affecting view of the horrors of feudalism. He takes us to the estate of a feudal Baron, and shows us the swineherd tending his master's swine. On the limb of that serf there is a chain, on his neck an iron collar, and on that collar we read the inscription—"Gurth, the thrall of Cerdric the Saxon." Now, when I examine the British Constitution I find inscribed upon it "Gurth, Gurth"—nothing but "Gurth;" "thrall, thrall"—nothing but "thrall." On the neck, so to speak, of the Act of Uniformity I find a collar with this inscription—ACT OF UNIFORMITY, GURTH, OR THRALL OF LAUDEAN PRELACY AND OF THE HIDEOUS OLD DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE RIGHT OF KINGS TO GOVERN WRONG. . On the collar of the Church of England I find this inscription—SEMI-POPISH, PRELATIO CHURCH OF ENGLAND, THRALL OF THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY. On the collar of the Church of Scotland I find this inscription—CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, THRALL OF ERASTIAN TYRANNY. On the collar of the Toleration Act I find these words—TOLERATION ACT, THRALL OF THE DOCTRINE OF POPISH INDULGENCES. And when I put together the three heads, or rather necks, of the three things which go to make up the British Constitution—namely, the Act of Uniformity, the Revolution Settlement, and the Toleration Act—I find on that neck this inscription, in words of blasphemy—BRITISH CONSTITUTION, THRALL OF POPERY, PRELACY, AND ERASTIANISM!!

"You have repeatedly stated," says my Presbyterian or Nonconformist friend, "that you can find nothing at all good in the British Constitution. Do you mean to say that the Christian religion as established by law in England and Scotland, is not a *good thing*?" Your question, my friend, shows that you quite misunderstand the subject. The Christian religion is not the establishment; the establishment is, THE MODE OR MANNER IN WHICH THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IS ESTABLISHED. Now, the Christian religion as established in England has been fearfully corrupted. In the Church of England, there is a "Calvanistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian Clergy;" and the Christian religion,

such as it is in England, is established in an anti-christian manner. The Christian religion in Scotland, is comparatively pure, but it is established on an Erastian basis. If the Christian religion *per se*, were an establishment, then, of course, all the Churches to which Paul, Peter, James and John, wrote epistles, were established churches—which is absurd. I therefore, assert once more, that neither I, nor any other man living, can state *one single thing* as regards ecclesiastical matters in the British Constitution that is really good. Of course, I do not refer to the *framework* of the Constitution,—our old forms of liberty,—for this framework and these forms, are all, or almost all, good; the best, I presume, by far, of any to be found on earth. But surely, no reasonable person would say, that a man's hat was his head, his shoes his feet, his clothes his body, or his body his soul! Rev. Mr. Kay, in his speech in the Glasgow Synod of 1862, spoke about the “good things” in the Constitution, and of the Testimony dealing “unjustly,” or “hardly” with the “British Constitution;” now, would Mr. Kay come out and tell us what are the “good things” in the Constitution? I challenge him to do so; he can't do so: he can't put his finger on *one single good thing* in the whole British Constitution—NO, NOT ONE!

Let us now consider the relation which the Oath of Allegiance bears to the British Constitution.

THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION AND THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

The question to be considered here is, does the Oath of Allegiance cover or homologate the whole Constitution; or to employ a legal term, does the oath of a Juror re-duplicate upon the Coronation Oath? That it does so, I have not the slightest doubt. If all the lawyers in the Three Kingdoms asserted that it did not do so, I would not believe them: I could believe nothing but an explicit Act of Parliament, saying that only a very small bit of the Constitution was to be sworn to, and that every one was to swear to whatever bit he chose. Nay, I would not believe even an Act of Parlia

ment, should that Act say that the juror's oath did not cover or homologate the whole Constitution ; and why ? Just because, even although it should be declared that *legally* the oath does not homologate the whole Constitution, I would still maintain that *morally*, it does homologate the whole Constitution. Suppose a person were living in a nation whose Constitution embodied the " Spanish Inquisition," or, " The Inquisition ;" and suppose this person were told that his oath to the Constitution did not homologate " the Inquisition," and that he might swear to the Constitution with a good conscience, would not the moral nature of such a person rise up in rebellion against the opinion of the lawyers who should so teach him ? I have long held that Erastianism is just Popery in another form ; or *vice versa*. Put a mortal in the stead of Jesus Christ ; place this mortal either " under" or above Christ ; on his right or left hand ; call this mortal the supreme head under Christ " on earth," or supreme head under Christ on earth, in heaven, hell, and purgatory ; call this mortal a Pope or a King—do as you may with him, after all your " paltering in a double sense," I just call this mortal an antichrist, and I call the system that raises such an one to his bad pre-eminence by the name **POPERY** ! I do most sincerely respect and honour Queen Victoria, as the model daughter, the model wife, the model mother, and the model friend ; and I believe that her amiable family are worthy of the respectful and affectionate regards of every good man. I know not whether Queen Victoria is *in heart* an Erastian, but I know that by *statute law*, she must be an Erastian. My own conviction is, that Erastianism is a burden that sits heavily on the Queen—my only reason for saying so is, that the balls, and routs, and fashionable frippery of London life, appear to sit heavily upon her, and she appears to be nowhere so much *at home* as at her " Highland home." The London papers have been actually scolding and dogging her for years, calling upon her to come out into *le beau monde* ; but like the deaf adder, she stops her ears, and absolutely refuses to hear even the *Times* and all its thunderings. I may

be mistaken, but my decided conviction is that the *Queen* is *too good for the Constitution*. What! Will a good Christian swear an absolute Oath of Allegiance to a Constitution which takes a poor, mortal, sinful human being, and tells him that he *must* act the part of Supreme Head of God's Church on earth, whether he will or not? You may put in, "under Christ," if you like; this expletive matters nothing to me; for I hold that a usurper *under* a prince, is not very unlike a usurper *over* a prince. I believe that if the matter were fairly put before the Queen, by the Lords and Commons, the Queen would be sincerely glad to get rid of the blasphemous title of the head of the Church. But, ah! this would not suit "My Lords of the Upper House." On the occasion of the Disruption of the Church of Scotland, a certain noble Peer said, "And ye know, my Lords, that we are all Erastians to the back bone." The Bishops and Cardinals of the Church of Rome, in order that they may have a horrible Boggle—Bo, to frighten and keep in subjection the priests and the people, choose one of their number whom they call Pope, and then they fall down and worship him, and tell the world that he is infallible. My Lords of the Upper House must have a Boggle-Bo, too. In order to keep "the people" in thorough subjection, they are always pointing to, and appealing to Boggle-Bo. And the fact is, that the people of England have been so thoroughly frightened and unmanned by Boggle-Bo, that there is not a single congregation in the whole English Church and would ever think of refusing any minister whom "My Lord Bishop" may please to appoint over them—although that minister, not having the call of the people, enters upon his work in the character of an ecclesiastical "thief and robber." (see John x. i.) And so, my Lords of the Upper House, you are all Erastians to the back-bone! Very well, there remains nothing that I can do but state the truth, which is that, on your own showing, you are all spiritual thieves and robbers, spiritual tyrants and usurpers, to the back-bone. The Queen has no interest, nor advantage whatever in the headship of

the Crown, because she has no sons in "the Church." A clever English writer has stated that, for centuries, the aristocracy of England have held sole dominion over "the Army, the Navy, and the Church." This writer, indeed, is very severe:—he says that the Army and Navy are for the smart lads, but the Church for "the fool of the family." Now, if this latter statement be true, how could it be expected that any congregation would give a call to the "fool of the family?" But mark the cunning of the chiefs of the Constitution! In order to be a match for the people, to tyrannize and trample over them, these lords of the Constitution have dressed up a hideous anti-christian idol which they call "The Headship of the Crown," in order that, under cover of this idol, these lords—or at least their sons—may put in their pockets the £7,238,000 *per annum* given by the State in support of the Church of England, and so, by patronage, they *force* their sons upon the people without asking the people's leave! Now, they call the hideous idol that they have set up, "the headship of the Crown," but it just means their own headship, or, in other words, the manifestation of the fourth dreadful and terrible wild beast, which devours and breaks in pieces and stamps the residue with the feet of it. William III., when he gained the English Throne, sought hard from the old Tory lords of 1689, to obtain permission to attend any place of worship he might choose, but those lords would not hear of such a thing; and were the Queen of England to attend any place of worship other than one connected with the semi-Popish Church of England or the Erastian Church of Scotland, she would violate the law of the land. In fact, Erastianism is, by the Constitution, attached *for ever* to the British Crown, and the monarch has no choice in the matter at all. Now, I ask, how can any Presbyterian or Protestant Nonconformist deliberately swear to a Constitution which retains in it a principle so thoroughly immoral and unscriptural as that of the Erastian headship of the Crown?

That every person who swears the Oath of Allegiance, swears to the whole Constitution as established by law, has

been ably shown by the late Rev. William Anderson of Loanhead, Scotland, in his work on the "Claims of The Divine Government, &c.;" but I shall follow a method the very opposite of Mr. Anderson's. Mr. Anderson gives the direct, positive, legal, and Scriptural proof, for the point under consideration; my remarks can only be viewed as a sort of sequel to what Mr. Anderson has taught. Mr. Anderson has shown from statute law, what a man who takes the Oath of Allegiance *must, of necessity,* swear to; I go to the juror and ask him *what he himself allows that he does,* when he swears the Oath of Allegiance. To use a logical expression; by showing the absurdity of the negative, I prove the truth of the positive.

ONLY THREE POSSIBLE NEGATIVE THEORIES.

If a man does not take the Oath of Allegiance, in the plain, legal acceptation of the terms, his mind must, in taking the oath, be occupied by one of three possible ideas; viz., he may take it as a mere form; or, with the idea of accepting the good while rejecting the evil; or, thirdly, he may swear to the Constitution, not as it is, but as the majority may ultimately make it. I think it must be allowed, that to these three ideas, even the great Stagirite himself, could not possibly add a fourth.

THE MERE FORM, OR NOTHING-AT-ALL, THEORY.

Covenanters, have all along held, and still do hold, that every one who takes the Oath of Allegiance, swears to support Episcopacy in England, Presbyterianism in Scotland, Popery in Canada and Malta, and Paganism in Hindostan; whereas, my Presbyterian, or Nonconformist friend, asserts that such an idea is perfectly monstrous! An advocate of *mere form, or nothing-at-all,* theory, says,—“When I swear the Oath of Allegiance, I just go up to the officer of the court, he reads to me the Oath, I kiss the book and the whole affair is over—in fact, it is *as easy as kiss!*” Yes, indeed, I reply, it is as easy as kiss, because it is *kiss,* and nothing but kiss. The person who swears the Oath of Allegiance in such a fashion as this, has no correct idea in his mind, he takes the

Oath merely as a step to office ; as the only way whereby he can attain to place, power, and pension. With regard to this strange theory I remark as follows :—

First :—It is *unscriptural* and *immoral*. The “ Confession of Faith ” states that, “ A lawful oath is a part of religious worship, wherein, upon just occasion, the person swearing, solemnly calleth God to witness what he asserteth or promiseth ; and to judge him according to the truth or falsehood of what he sweareth.” The same confession also asserts, that “ Whosoever taketh an oath, ought duly to consider the weightiness of so solemn an act, and therein to avouch nothing but what he is fully persuaded is the truth.” Now, if an oath—say, the Oath of Allegiance—is “ a part of religious worship,” it is not *a mere form* ! And again, if the person who sweareth the Oath of Allegiance, says that in so doing, he avoucheth *nothing-at-all*, how can he be said “ to avouch nothing but what he is fully persuaded is the truth ? ” What a fearful thing it is to contemplate a person essaying a solemn act of religious worship, under an act of taking an oath, and to consider that that person in the performance of his solemn act, after he has called upon God to witness his performance, turns aside and virtually says to Jehovah, “ Lord, am I not in sport ? ” Such a man has never “ duly considered the weightiness ” of his solemn act ; he knows not whether he swears to maintain Prelacy and Popery or not ; nor indeed, does he care, as all he wants is, to enjoy post, or pension, or both.

Second :—Do those who take the Oath of Allegiance with the idea that their act is *a mere form*, never seriously consider what *other people* have thought, and do still think, of swearing the Oath of Allegiance ? The law of the land most distinctly asserts that the oath is taken to the Sovereign, not as an individual, but as the head or representative of the Constitution :—hence, the celebrated lawyer, Lord Cuninghame, defines the Oath of Allegiance thus :—“ What was the Oath of Allegiance ? A solemn acknowledgment of Queen Victoria as the rightful Sovereign of these realms. It was nothing

more nor less than *an acknowledgment of the Constitution of the Nation.*" Now, if the Oath of Allegiance has reference to the Constitution at all, it must have reference to the *whole* Constitution ; or else, some Act of Parliament declaring that some particular part of the Constitution is not to be sworn to, must be produced. If the Oath of Allegiance is a mere form, how comes it that no person can take his seat in parliament until he has sworn the oath ? Why so much ado about a mere form ? And what did the two thousand ministers in England think of the Oath of Allegiance ? Rather than conform to the Act of Uniformity, these " worthy, learned, pious, orthodox divines," as the philosophic Locke styles them, forsook all that is dear to human nature, and went out, not knowing whither they went. And what of the four hundred ministers in Scotland, who, rather than prove traitors to the Crown rights of their Redeemer, abandoned their livings and their homes ? What was the renowned Donald Cargill's opinion of the supremacy of the Crown ? Immediately before his martyrdom he said,—“ Seeing that power taken from Christ, which is His glory, and made the essential of an earthly crown, seemed to me as if one were wearing my husband's garments after he had killed him. There is no distinction we can make that can free the conscience of the acknowledger from being a partaker of this sacrilegious robbing of God. And it is but to cheat our consciences to acknowledge the civil power ; for it is not civil power only that is of the essence of the Crown ; and seeing they are so express, we ought to be plain ; for otherwise we deny our testimony, and consent that Christ be robbed of His glory.” And are the solemn convictions of the pious “ lassie” who “ died for the Covenant,” to go for nothing ? Life was as desirable to her young heart as it was to others ; and yet, because she would not acknowledge King Charles II. to be Supreme head on earth of the Church of the living God, she perished in the dark waters of the Solway !

Dr. Goold will not allow that the Headship of the British Crown is “ blasphemous ;” he says it is “ an evil and wicked thing,” but not “ blasphemous.” I grant that no competent

authority has ever decided what are the doctrines or principles, included under the term "blasphemy." The literal import of the word is "to make unfit." or "to injure" by "a report;" but in its higher and Scriptural signification it intends "the sin of cursing God, or speaking slightly of Him and His attributes." *When* an erroneous doctrine amounts to a "blasphemy," I do not attempt to decide. In the early Christian Church, as Bingham in his "Antiquities of the Christian Church," shews, blasphemy was distinguished into three kinds; 1. The blasphemy against the HOLY GHOST; 2. The blasphemy of apostates; that is, adoring "the images of the gods, and also cursing Christ." 3. The blasphemy of "impious doctrines, or profane discourses." "Arianism," was ranked under this third kind of blasphemy; and if Arianism, which strikes at the Divinity of Christ, is blasphemy, why should not the Headship of the British Crown, which strikes at Christ's Kingly Office, be also spoken of as "blasphemous?" I assert, in flat contradiction to Dr. Goold, that as the Headship of the British Crown strikes directly against the Kingly power of Christ, it is blasphemous," and that, too, in a very high degree.

Dr. Goold employs two arguments to prove that the Headship of the British Crown is not blasphemous; first, because it is not so bad as the Headship of the Pope; and secondly, because it is limited "by a certain power allowed to the Church (see Report of Discussion in R. P. Synod, 1862, p. 88, 89). Now, it is quite clear that the Headship of the British Crown may be blasphemous, and yet not just so bad as that of the Pope; but I maintain, that, *in principle*, the one is equal to the other. They both take from Christ "that power which is His glory," and make it "the essential of an earthly crown." Dr. Goold says that the prerogative claimed by the British Crown, is only claimed as "next and under Christ;" and that "it is not the papal claim of supremacy to be *in the place of Christ*." Now, it is utterly untrue to say that the Pope ever claimed to be *in the place of Christ*, in any other sense than that in which the British Sovereign claims

to be *in the place* of Christ. Article X. of the "Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth," states distinctly what the title and claim of the Pope really are :—"The Bishop of Rome, successor to S. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and *Vicar* of Jesus Christ." The Pope, therefore, does not claim *to be* Jesus Christ,—as Dr. Goold actually has the audacity to insinuate,—but merely to be the "Vicar of Jesus Christ." The Land Steward who manages a gentleman's estate, is not the gentleman ; nor is he *in the place* of the gentleman, in any other sense but as *manager* of his estate. Article XXXVII., of the Church of England states that, "The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of *England*, and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief government of the estates of this Realm, whether they be *Ecclesiastical* or Civil, in all causes doth appertain." Now, as regards *Ecclesiastical* matters, what does the Pope claim more ? Most decidedly, nothing at all ! I know that, as regards the *results* of the respective claims of the Pope and the English monarch, the results of the former are far more terrible than those of the latter ; but the claim itself, *in its spirit or essence*, is the same, in either case. Let us suppose the case of an unknown person entering Dr. Goold's house, sitting down unasked, and then proceeding to give directions as to how Dr. Goold was to conduct himself during the day. "It is my will and pleasure, Dr. Goold," he declares, "that you rise every day at seven of the clock, breakfast at nine, dine at two, take tea at six, and go to bed at ten. You are to live on the fat of the earth, and before you go to bed, you are to direct your servant to draw the warming-pan over the sheets, and when you lie down you are to tuck yourself in the blankets as snugly as possible." Now, in such a case, *what* would it be that would stir up Dr. Goold's choler to such a pitch of fury, as that he would immediately order the scoundrel out of his house ? Would it be because the directions of the intruder, if obeyed, would do him any harm ? By no means. The whole and sole reason of his anger would be, simply because the intruder dared to take upon him to dictate to Dr. Goold, as to how he should conduct himself in his

own house? The Church is God's House; and the Lord Jesus Christ is the alone Head thereof, and He has committed the government of His Church—not to Popes or Civil Rulers,—but into the hands of Presbyters, or Elders, chosen by the members of the Church, and regularly ordained. Any one, therefore, who dares to intrude into Christ's Church, as the pretended head thereof, under whatever name or character, is a daring usurper, yea, a spiritual thief and a robber!

But, Dr. Goold also says that the Headship of the British Crown is limited “by a certain power allowed to the Church.” Here, again, I meet Dr. Goold with a flat contradiction—there is no “certain power allowed to the Church.” The Church of England is a complete Ecclesiastical dummy,—she has not spoken a single word for the last two hundred years! “Convocation” cannot meet until it is summoned to do so by royal license; when met, “Convocation” cannot “constitute any canons without the assent of the King;” nay, so completely is it a slave of the Crown, that it “has not even the power of adjournment; so that should the deliberations be protracted beyond the first day, the Archbishop not being able to adjourn the meeting, prorogues it.” So that, to talk of the Church having “a certain power” to do anything at all is, in the highest degree, absurd! Indeed, Dr. Goold seemed to have been of this opinion himself; for of this “certain power” he says,—“It is but a small amount, perhaps it is next to nothing, perhaps it will be better to say it amounts to nothing.” Why then does Dr. Goold say that the Church has “a certain power” to limit the headship of the Crown, when he himself declares that this power “amounts to nothing?” Surely, Dr. Goold will not deny the truth of the adage of the old philosophers, that *ex nihilo nihil fit*,—from nothing, nothing comes? But let us hear what follows—the headship of the British Crown, is also limited, saith Dr. Goold, by the example of the “Godly princes in Judah.” I am well aware that the Godly princes of Judah did employ their official authority in seeking to promote the cause of true religion; but when did any of the Godly princes of Judah lay

claim to the blasphemous title of "Supreme head, in all things civil and ecclesiastic," over God's Church on earth? Would Dr. Goold be so kind as to name which of the Godly princes of Judah it was, who was guilty of such an enormous iniquity?

Third :—But, if it is really the case that the Oath of Allegiance has no particular meaning at all, and binds to nothing at all, why do those who take the Oath in this sense not agitate the question, so as to have the form of the oath so altered as to correspond with the theory? There is no doubt but that the Oath, as it now stands, is an Oath to Queen Victoria and the British Constitution; but if *nothing-at-all* is the subject of the Oath, then clearly the form of the oath should stand as follows:—"I—do swear that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance to her Majesty, Queen Victoria (*to Its Majesty, Nothing-at-all*), and will defend her (*It*) to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatever, which shall be made against her person, crown, or dignity (*against Its person, &c., &c.*), and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to her Majesty, her Heirs, and Successors (*to Its Majesty, Heirs, and Successors*), &c., &c." What sane man would swear an oath,—such as the Oath of Allegiance amended after the above fashion? And yet, multitudes say that in taking the Oath of Allegiance they bind themselves to nothing-at-all!

THE SWEARING TO WHAT IS GOOD, AND REJECTING WHAT IS EVIL, THEORY.

With regard to *good* and *bad* in the Constitution, I have stated my views before. I hold that the *outward framework*, or *machinery*, of the Constitution is, perhaps, the best anywhere to be found on the face of the earth; but I hold that, in the Constitution *itself*, that is, in the Act of Uniformity, the Revolution Settlement, and the Toleration Act, there is not, as regards ecclesiastical matters, a single good thing. I hold that the Constitution, as thus defined, is *Antichristian*; and I hold that Britain is still "a horn of the beast."

First:—The person who, in swearing the Oath of Allegiance, says that, in that solemn act, he has reference only to *what is good* in the Constitution, makes open profession that, in taking the Oath, he acts in a *jesuitical manner*. The last clause in the Oath of Allegiance is,—“and I make this declaration on the true faith of a Christian.” Now, to swear on the true faith of a Christian, is to swear “in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness” (see Jer. iv. 2); that is, to swear nothing but what is agreeable to truth, to swear upon due consideration, and to swear what is agreeable to justice. But, if to swear to maintain Presbyterianism in Scotland, and Popery in Canada, is to swear “in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness,” then we must allow, that reason and Revelation are both at fault. But, saith my Presbyterian or Nonconformist friend, “I don’t swear to support Popery in Canada, but I do swear to support Presbyterianism in Scotland.” Well, then, I say to you that you are guilty of equivocation and mental reservation, and you do not, as the Confession of Faith requires, swear “in the plain and common sense of the words, without equivocation or mental reservation.” To be plain with you, I tell you deliberately, that you swear as a Jesuit might swear! The Jesuits have devised a great many ways of evading the sanction of an oath. One of these ways, as laid down by Sanchez, is as follows:—After saying *aloud*, “I swear that I have not done that,” the person upon oath is to add, in a *whisper*, “to-day,” &c. Now, sir, do you tell me that, in swearing the Oath of Allegiance, you say *aloud*, “I—do swear that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance to her Majesty, Queen Victoria, and to the Constitution of which she is the Head;” and that in a *whisper* you say, “but I will not be faithful to semi-Popish Prelacy in England, neither will I be faithful to Popery in Canada, nor to Heathenism in India?” But, according to this theory, you might connect yourself with an Arian Church, because Arians believe that there is a God,—and so, do you. In accordance with the same theory, you might also join a Popish chapel, because the Church of Rome believes

in the doctrine of the Trinity, and so do you. The same principle would enable you to connect yourself with a Jewish Synagogue, because the Jews believe in the Old Testament, and so do you. According to the same principle, you might even become a Turk, for five times a-day the Muezzin may be heard from the lofty minarets of Constantinople, making proclamation "God is great, God is most great; there is no God but God,"—and you also believe that there is "no God but God." Yes, in accordance with the same theory, a person might join the Thugs in India, the Brigands in Italy, or the most degraded tribe of savages that roam the wilds of Africa; for it is allowed by the most eminent divines, that no human being is as bad as he might be, and that in the most immoral society of men there remains some feeble ray of the light of original rectitude,—some small trace of that humanity which, when touched, makes the whole world kin.

Second :—The Constitution itself makes no allowance for persons swearing to it, in the way of accepting or rejecting it, *in parts*. Although the Constitution consists of several parts, yet it is one and indivisible. Hence, the late eminent lawyer, J. S. More, Esq., Advocate and Professor of Scots Law in the University of Edinburgh, thus writes: "The Oath of Allegiance, as modified at the Revolution of 1688, to its present form, was undoubtedly intended to bind every person who swore it to recognise and submit to the *Constitution* as then settled. The allegiance to the King, to which the Oath binds, has reference to him as *the head of the Constitution*; it includes *an assent* to the principles of the Constitution." While the great majority of the inhabitants of these lands make no scruple in taking the Oath of Allegiance, Covenanters refuse to do so for two reasons:—first, because the British Constitution is founded on the ruins of a Scriptural and Covenanted Constitution; and secondly, because it contains things *immoral, unscriptural, anti-scriptural, and even anti-Christian*.

THE SWEARING TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION, THEORY.

A man may say, "well, now, I do perceive that, as a Christian man, I really cannot swear the Oath of Allegiance

under the notion that I am swearing to *nothing-at-all*; and I do also confess that I am a convert to the view that there is nothing good in the ecclesiastical arrangements of the Constitution to which I can swear; but I will swear under this idea, *I will swear to the Constitution in order to amend it.*" This, I very well know, is the great drag net which drags along tens of thousands in its mighty sweep, and we must look straight in the face a theory which, for multitudes, serves as a screen to cover their want of fidelity to high moral principle.

That there are great and good men,—up to the measure of their light,—in the British Parliament, I am glad to acknowledge; and I also believe that, of late years, several acts of very beneficent legislation have been carried into effect, such as Free Trade, Lord Shaftesbury's Factories Act, the Disendowment and Disestablishing of the Irish Church, and the Ballot and Irish Land Acts,—by which latter two Acts, a whole province of hereditary bondsmen have been at once converted into freemen, if they only know how to use their privileges aright. Now, at this part of my subject, there is an idea which I am most anxious to press upon the attention of the reader, and the idea is this: that the writer has found that many persons seem to imagine that, when swearing the Oath of Allegiance, they are not swearing to the Act of Uniformity, the Revolution Settlement, and the Toleration Act, BUT TO MODERN ACTS OF BENEFICENT LEGISLATION! Can, it is asked with an air of triumph, good fruit grow on a bad tree; can beneficent acts of legislation proceed from an immoral Constitution? But this is an entire mistake. Modern Acts of beneficent legislation have nothing to do with the Constitution. These Acts would go on just as well, yes, and a great deal better too, under a scriptural, than under an unscriptural, Constitution. Dozens of examples might be given to show, that the Constitution, instead of aiding and abetting good legislation, presents a dead set to Acts that would be for the Spiritual and temporal well-being of man:—one example will suffice, namely, the Bill for the Closing of Public Houses during the whole of the Lord's Day in Ireland. In all Popish

lands, the Sabbath is over as soon as the priest has done mid-day mass, and since the times of the "Book of Sports," the *theory* of the Church of England,—that is, in other words, of the British Constitution,—is that the Sabbath is over at two o'clock ! But although the Constitution does, in several respects, make a dead set against Scriptural legislation, it does not make a dead set against the most outrageous immorality, as is seen in the continuance of the Contagious Diseases Act on the Statute Book ! Not only is the British Constitution *not* a Christian Constitution,—in the proper acceptation of the terms,—but it does not even *pretend* to be such :—and this was admitted by Lord John Russel when he brought in his Bill for the admission of Jews into parliament. It is the "merest delusion," said his lordship, to speak of the British Constitution as "Christian ;" "for does it not," said he, "admit to its pale, Protestants and Romanists, Deists and Infidels, Hindoos and Turks, and, if so, why not admit Jews also."

First :—To swear to a thing that is immoral, with the object of amending the thing that is immoral, is an act that is *highly immoral and unscriptural*. It is quite easy to conceive the case of a man taking a neglected farm in order to improve it, and to improve his circumstances at the same time. It is possible to conceive the case of a woman marrying a man, concerning whose peculiarities she may have some little doubts, hoping that by steadfast affection she may ultimately eradicate those peculiarities ; but the idea of a person deliberately swearing to an evil, in order to reform or remove that evil, seems to me to outrage reason, and shock every feeling of moral propriety ! In all sciences, there are what are called *first principles*, that is, things which no one but a fool can deny, but which if denied, renders all reasoning, as regards a particular science, utterly impossible. Now, the very first principle in moral science, as distinctly laid down in Scripture, is, that we are never, under any circumstances, TO DO EVIL THAT GOOD MAY COME. If a man denies that this is a first principle in moral science, then, with that

man, as regards moral science, we can reason no more. And why? Simply, because he has denied a first principle; he slays moral science in its very birth-throes; he poisons morality at its very fountain head; and he stands forth a self-made, self-proclaimed, moral paralytic! An oath taken to a sinful thing, with the view of amending that thing, is *ipso facto*, an immoral oath; because, if the thing is so bad that it requires material amendment, it ought not to be sworn to at all. To swear the Oath of Allegiance in order to amend the Constitution, is, of necessity, an absurd, immoral, and unscriptural act. It is *absurd*, because it is just the same as saying, "I swear to keep up the Constitution, and I swear to put down the Constitution." It is *immoral*, because it amounts to virtual perjury; and it is unscriptural, because we never read of God, or good men, swearing to amend, or change, but *to keep*, their oaths. The bible tells us that an oath for confirmation is an *end* of all strife; but according to the *amending* theory, the Oath of Allegiance is only the *beginning* of all strife! In fact, to swear to the Constitution, in order to amend it, is a disloyal, deceitful, and treacherous thing; because the Constitution, or "the Lords of the Constitution," cannot, by any possibility, know what the man who thus swears, really intends—how much, and what parts, of the Constitution, he intends to abolish, and how much to preserve.

In the speech above referred to, I find Dr. Goold using these words—"If a man says, I take the Oath (of Allegiance) not believing that it pledges directly, in any sense, to the evils of the Constitution, *but to a certain course for the removal of these evils*, &c. Suppose, now, we insert "Pope," in place of "the Oath," and then try how the sentence would read! A man swears to the Pope; then he says that he is not, "in a sense," pledged to the Pope; "but to a certain course for the removal" of the Pope, or the popery of the Pope! If a man were to so act and speak, would not all men of sense say, that such a fellow was quite ripe for a lunatic asylum? I am exceedingly sorry to say what I am about to

say ; but principle and public duty compel me to speak. Former acquaintanceship, and respect for Dr. Goold as a man, I fling to the winds ; and I assert that, the whole of Dr. Goold's supposition, given above, is highly sophistical and immoral ! If the principle contained in this supposition, were universally acted upon, the whole framework of society would be at once dissolved, and earth turned into a Pandemonium ! The judge on the bench could not believe a man on his oath, because every witness would have his own version of the oath :—and I do most firmly believe, and have for years believed, that, next to Popery itself, there is nothing more calculated to dissolve society than the improper administration, and taking of oaths. *Three*, at least, of the Scotch lawyers, to whom the *Quondam* R. P. Synod of Scotland submitted their one-sided queries, appear to have been so much struck, or rather shocked, by those queries, that they cried out, as if in agony, that there ought to be no oaths at all !! To quote one out of the three :—Hugh Barclay, Esq., LL.D., Sheriff Substitute of Perthshire, writes thus :—“ Instead of raising nice questions of casuistry, it will be better to unite, and put the axe at the root, and get *all* Oaths of every kind abolished. They startle those of weak and tender conscience, and are of no effect on those of opposite character. None but a judge or magistrate can estimate the increasing amount and enormity of perjury daily perpetrated with most daring effrontery. The moral and religious effects of such profligacy is wide spreading, and more than anything, loosens the very bonds of society.”

When Dr. Goold speaks of the Oath of Allegiance, as an Oath, not taken to the Constitution, but “ to a certain course for the removal” or amendment of the Constitution, he employs language so outrageously grotesque as “ to point a moral,” sure enough ! Has Dr. Goold not the sense to perceive, that an oath to remove or amend a person or thing, is not an oath *to* the person or thing at all ! The Barons at Runnymede swore that “ no freeman shall be arrested, or imprisoned, or deprived of property, or outlawed, or banished,”

except after legal trial by the "judgment of his peers;" but, of course, according to Dr. Goold's theory, what the old Barons intended was that they would allow a freeman to be hanged and quartered without judge or jury! Our Covenanting forefathers in subscribing to the Solemn League and Covenant,—some of them with blood taken from their own veins, of course only meant that they would "remove," or burn the Covenant, on the first convenient occasion; and the idea that any one would think of *dying* for it, was, of course, a forbidden thought. When a man marries a woman, of course, according to Dr. Goold's theory, he does not take her to act the part of a faithful husband toward her, but simply to *remove* or *amend* her. Pity the sorrows of the poor wife who should be exposed to the tender mercies of Dr. Goold's logical cudgel! The poor thing would be removed and amended to her heart's content. After daily chidings and mockings, and actual tortures, and frequent exposure to the night air, the poor wife might, with pleading look and tearful eye, demand to be placed in the enjoyment of conjugal rights; but the stern tyrant would reply, "I'm just *removing* and *amending* you, and I would recommend you to go home to your mamma, for as long as you stay here, it will be nothing but removing and amending to the end of the chapter."

Second :—When a man says that he will swear to the Constitution in order to amend it; he can intend nothing else but that he will swear to the Constitution as, *by the majority it may be ultimately amended*. This is as certain as any moral proposition can be. But how can any Christian man swear such a hideous Freemason Oath as this would be? A man may swear to an *esse*, to a thing that exists; but how can he swear to a *posse* or a *fuisse*, to a thing that may never exist? And then, suppose the Constitution should be amended, how can a man swear that he will approve of whatever the majority may set up? What if the Constitution should be amended the wrong way; what if it should become still more Erastian, Popish, and Infidel? Amended the wrong way, it most undoubtedly shall be, if Deists, Infidels, or

Papists should become the majority. Amended the wrong way, it must be, if the skeptical and infidel spirit of the age should continue to advance unchecked for some time longer, at the rate at which it is now progressing. Far be it from the writer to assume the thankless office of a Cassandra, and to wail over what may never occur, Popish ascendancy in Britain. Mr. Gladstone says that there is no fear of such a thing ; and I must acknowledge that I am inclined to adopt Mr. Gladstone's view ; yet, at the same time, I most firmly believe the truth of what Sir Walter Scott said on the passing of the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act, namely, that it was " a terrible hazard, the casting of a most fearful die." Into the domain of Prophecy I enter not ; I simply look at what I see around me. I see Papists at the Bar and on the Bench ; in the Army and Navy ; and in the very Privy Council of the Sovereign ! I see Popish Chaplains in every jail and Poor's House in the land ; and I see two Popish cardinals—one in Dublin and the other at Westminster, and I am told that we are soon to have a third in Scotland !! Oh, shall we have no new intellectual Janet Geddes, openly to resist such a fearful aggression as this would be—to see a Popish Cardinal, a Popish Prince, " tithe or toll," in the land of the National Covenant !!!

The Rev. E. Bickersteth, Rector of Watton, in England, in his preface to the last edition of Bishop Hall's " No Peace with Rome," writes as follows :—" It is perfectly astonishing how papal principles have, in the last twenty-five years, revived and spread throughout the world. They insinuate themselves everywhere ; into all places of education, into newspapers and periodicals, into arts and sciences, architecture, trade and commerce ; into all classes of society ; all countries, east and west, north and south ; into missions, societies, exertions ; among rulers and statesmen, ministers and people ; universities, colleges, training establishments and schools ; in palaces, in mansions, in shops and cottages ; by bulky publications, by light novels, and by multiplied tracts. The very universality shows the character of the evil as a supernatural judgment on the nations for their iniquities."

Men talk and write, of the probability, possibility, or the impossibility of Popish ascendancy; whereas, the plain truth is, that we have Popish ascendancy,—and that, too, in no small degree,—IN THE CONSTITUTION ITSELF; and in Ireland, we have practical Popish ascendancy, in a very emphatic manner! The late Chief-Justice Whiteside openly stated, some time before his death, that the greater part of Ireland was governed through the Jury Box and otherwise, not by Queen Victoria, but by Cardinal Cullen and the Pope; and for so saying, the Chief-Justice was sharply taken to task in Parliament, by the Prime Minister!

With regard to the National System of Education for Ireland, while I grant that, in several respects, it is an admirable system, yet, at the same time, I must declare that its fundamental principle is Popish and Infidel. The Bible is admitted into the *school-house* (for it is the merest farce and falsehood to say that the Bible is not *entirely* excluded from the National *Schools*) at stated hours, just on the very same principle, as are the most damnable doctrines of the Church of Rome. The Bible, although freely read in the *school-house*, has never *once* been read in a single National *School* in all Ireland. From first to last, the system has been a great concession to Popery, and by it Popery is virtually endowed, and that to an enormous extent.

And what of the Workhouse? Why, I think that I might almost say, that in many cases, the Popish Chaplain “reigns and revels” in the Workhouse! Let the porter introduce a few religious tracts into “the house,” and anon the Popish Chaplain lays in his complaint to the Guardians, or writes, perhaps to the Government Board, and the porter is dismissed or severely rebuked. Let the poor, weary night nurse, who has been walking, perhaps, the wards of the fever hospital during the “lee-lang” night, neglect to have the “little cards” that indicate the religion of the patients, “all right,” when the Popish Chaplain may call—then woe-betide her! Ten to one, she shall be dismissed. Now reader, here is a fine *Protestant* Constitution for you! Here, the Constitution

actually "tickets-off" poor souls, as a merchant would "ticket-off" bales of goods in his store, or a farmer mark his cattle in a fair ! In the Bible, we are taught that one important part of the traffic which the Whore of Babylon has always carried on, has been traffic in "the *souls* of men ;"—and I ask my reader, is it not traffic in the "souls of men," to take up, as the British Government has done, the whole Catholic youth of Ireland, and cast them alive into the burning fiery furnace of Popish ignorance and despotism, which has been kindled up by Cardinal Cullen and the Pope ? Is it not traffic in the souls of men, to "ticket-off," by statute law, poor, blind, deluded Papists ; and to absolutely forbid, by statute law, some kind Christian lips to whisper one word of peace in the ear of the deluded Romanist ; to tell him in the dark, dreary hours of midnight, when heart and flesh fail ; to tell, I say, the poor, restless, weary head, that there is "one Jesus," who was born in Bethlehem of Judah, in the days of Herod the King ; is this, I ask, not to traffic in souls of men ? Oh, where is the glorious John Knox, where the renowned Donald Cargill ? Oh, for some mighty statesmen, to break through the hosts of the Philistines, and draw water out of the well of Bethlehem, that is by the gate, and give it to the poor souls consigned, by statute law, to the tender mercies of the Man of Sin.

Nor, have we yet done with Popish ascendancy in Ireland ; for Popery, too frequently, reigns at the polling-booth. Whigs and Tories, both alike, rush along at a break-neck pace, in order, if possible, to secure the "Catholic vote." To obtain this much coveted prize, liberals, it is to be feared, have voted against the Bill for the opening up of nunneries to public inspection ; and for the same object, there is too much reason to suspect that the descendant of the hero of Blenheim has been busily occupied in visiting Popish institutions in and around Dublin, and feasting Cardinal Cullen and the Popish bishops, at the Viceregal Lodge.

Third:—"I do confess," says my friend, "that, as far as logic is concerned, you have fairly driven me into a corner ;

because if I swear to submit to whatever Constitution the majority may set up, then I do, most assuredly, swear that I will become an Infidel, a Deist, a Jew, or a Papist, just as the majority may decide :—but this is not my meaning at all. I simply mean, that there are a sufficient number of good Protestants in the Three Kingdoms to make the Constitution what it ought to be, *and that we are determined to make it what it ought to be.*” Well, my friend, I say at once, that you are right. There are a sufficient number of Protestants in the Three Kingdoms to make the Constitution what it ought to be. But why, let me ask, do you not *try* to make it what it ought to be ? Why is it that no man, for a period of two hundred years, has ever made the slightest effort to make it what it ought to be ? I do not stand now on what is stated by lawyers, that there are parts of the Constitution which are *essential* or *unalterable*, such as the monarchy, the Church of England, and the Headship of the Crown ; I grant, at once, that as things now are, the House of Commons is absolute and supreme. As Samson took the doors of the gate of the city of Gaza, and the two posts, and went away with them, bar and all, and put them upon his shoulders, and carried them up to the top of an hill ; so, I allow, can the House of Commons do with the Constitution. Allow me, then, to put your sincerity to the test. Draw out a Bill, such as that which passed through the Long Parliament ; say in your Bill, as was said in the Old Bill to which I allude, that you are determined “ to have Christ’s glory set up in the land ;” and say also that Prelacy, together with the Erastian headship of the Crown, the power and places of Churchmen, &c., are “ intolerable grievances,” and that they must be put down. Get two Ulster and two Free Church members of Parliament, to put their names to the Bill ; introduce it into Parliament if you *can* (ay, there’s the rub) ; take the vote, and then come and tell me how your enterprise has prospered. But till you do *that*, or *something like that*, you but “ palter with us in a *double* sense ; you keep the word of promise to our ear, and break it to our hope.” The truth is, the Oath

of Allegiance is an oath that I do not well see how an intelligent Christian man can guiltlessly swear ; for, like the other Oaths of Allegiance which have prevailed over Europe, for above a thousand years, it but binds to the “ throne of iniquity.” It is as a snare on Mizpah, and a net spread upon Tabor. The whole spirit of British legislation is “ Bestial ;” for in conducting the affairs of the nation, the bible is not even named by legislators ; an unholy expediency is the alone guiding star. Let us take an example from legislation going on at the present moment. Those members of Parliament who have charge of the Bill for the Closing of Public Houses in Ireland, during the whole of the Sabbath, are worthy of all praise ;—but, see what our legislators do. They appoint a Committee, gravely to ask the Sabbath-breaking, tippling, Papists of Belfast, Dublin, Cork, and Limerick, whether or not, they will allow the Fourth Commandment to remain in the Decalogue !! “ Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon.” Some, I suppose, would call this the legislation of expediency, but I call it open, rank, downright brazen-faced infidelity.”

Some men talk as if there were some sort of self-moving spring or principle in the Constitution, by which it will ultimately right itself ; but this is a great mistake,—at least, as things now are. It is true that any person may *propose* any change in the Constitution he may desire ; but it is also true that a man may call up spirits from the “ vasty deep ;” and the truth is, that I have as little hope of the British Constitution being amended by constitutional means, so long as Deists, Papists, and Infidels are admitted to its pale, as I would have of the “ spirits responding to the most urgent cry. I incline to the belief, that England’s Romeward career can be checked only by the whirlwind of revolution, either peaceful or otherwise. In fact, unless the Emancipation Act be repealed, and the Act of Classes be re-established, I do not see how a revolution can be avoided. Sometimes we hear men talk thus:—What reason have we to complain of the Constitution ; have we not a Toleration Act, and so, can speak

and act as we please?" Well, in reply—have not the Hot-tentots, the Kaffirs, the Hindoos, and the Red Men of the far West, a toleration, given to them by nature and nature's God; and have we not the grand, the divine, the glorious, the only genuine toleration act, in the words of the Saviour, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature? What right, then, has any mortal man to say to a fellow-mortal, that he will *permit* him to obey the Saviour? Does not the claim of power to *permit*, imply the claim of power to *forbid*?

The glorious "May Meetings," the Bible, Tract, Missionary, and all the other benevolent Societies, that form the crown and glory of our country, are not the outparts of the Constitution, but of the Christianity of the people. Similar benevolent societies exist in America, where the Constitution is openly Atheistic. The British Constitution, instead of aiding and abetting noble schemes for the evangelization of mankind, would, if it had the power, quench in blood every one of those noble schemes—I allude, of course, to the Act of Uniformity. Wheresoever we find holy men and women, there will we find works of piety and beneficence, even though it should be in priest-ridden and "Beast"-oppressed Spain. When it was attempted to introduce Prelacy into Scotland, under the guise of putting honour upon the Church, the Venerable Davidson, instantly detecting the guile of the Tulchan system, said,—“Busk, busk, busk him as bonnilie as ye can, and fetch him in as fairlie as ye will, we see him weill aneuch; we see the horns of his mitre.” So say I, of the British Constitution. Let sycophants “busk” it as “bonnilie” as they can, I see it “weill aneuch;”—’Tis but the effete and barbarous relic, of the barbarous past; the barbarous relic of the absolute and brute-force principles of Nimrod, of Nineveh, of Babylon, of Medo-Persia, of Greece, of Rome, and of the ten horned and two horned “Beasts” of the Apocalypse.

THE QUONDAM SCOTCH COVENANTERS.

The *whilome* Covenanters of Scotland, who,—having, it is greatly to be feared, “men’s persons in admiration because

of advantage,"—have done all in their power to blast, and consign to perpetual oblivion, the very name and memorial of the old time-honoured Covenanted Church of Scotland, have, *on their own showing*, abjured every single principle, hitherto called distinguishing, by genuine Covenanters. In the second "query" submitted by the *majority* Synod to a few Scotch lawyers, in relation to the import of the Oath of Allegiance, we find these words:—"or does the oath (of Allegiance) import no more than that the Juror will maintain and support these several systems in the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which, by Law, they are entitled, &c." Now, the import of this "query" or statement is, that if the Oath of Allegiance "imports no more," than what the statement presumes it does import, that then the querists are prepared to swear the Oath of Allegiance. What are "these several systems?" They are mentioned in pp. 18-19 of the "Report;" namely, the Prelatic Church of England, the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, Popery in Lower Canada, and Malta, and Paganism in Hindostan. Here, now, we have all these *whilome* Covenanters declaring that they are ready, at any moment, solemnly to swear before God that they will support "these several systems" in the enjoyment of the "rights and privileges to which, by law, they are entitled," *until* they can devise some way by which these systems can be amended or removed!!

Let us see, now, the "rights and privileges to which, by law," these several systems "are entitled. *First*, the Church of Scotland. This Church is entitled to her endowments, and also, to be chained to the State, like a galley-slave. *Second*, the Church of England. This Church is entitled, by law, to her "Liturgy," which abounds with Popish errors. She is also, by law, entitled to her "mode of worship," which is, in several respects, quite unscriptural. She is also, by law, entitled to her discipline," which is purely of a worldly character, and no decision of the Privy Council is ever issued in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, but always in the name of the Sovereign. The "government" of the Church of England is of the *absolute* character, peculiar to the Church

of Rome. "Patronage" is the law of the Church of England, and "livings" are advertised in the papers, and bought and sold like cattle in a fair. The Church of England is also, by law, entitled to her "income," which amounts, according to Mr. Frederick Martin's "Report," to, at least, £7,238,000 *per annum*—and this income is distributed in the most unjust manner, for while the dignitaries have enormous incomes, the hard-working curates receive a mere paltry pittance, not more, often, than £80 a-year! *Third*, as to Popery—Popery is the established religion of Malta and Lower Canada—in which latter country, it is endowed at the rate of about £270,000 *per annum*. *Fourth*, as to Paganism in Hindostan. Notwithstanding the horrors of the recent mutiny in India, it is yet true, that British Rulers still continue to exclude the bible from the schools and colleges of India, and also that British officials still continue to act as tax gatherers for the Heathen shrines of Hindostan! The conduct of successive British governments in regard to India, has been perfectly scandalous. After conquering the country, the Church of England, with a bishop at its head, was set up for the British residents, as a mere monopoly; but not the slightest effort has been made to direct the poor Hindoos to the Saviour of sinners! In consequence of the total exclusion of the Bible from the schools and colleges of India, while, on the one hand, the axe has been laid to the root of old Hindoo superstitions, on the other hand, a wide spread scepticism has been the natural result.

Now, here is the position in which our Scotch *whilome* Covenanting friends, who are now rejoicing in the bosom of the Free Church, have, *on their own showing*, placed themselves:—they all stand prepared to swear that they will "maintain and support," Prelacy in England, Presbytery in Scotland, Popery in Lower Canada and Malta, and Paganism in Hindostan, *until* they may devise some plan by which these "several systems" may be removed!! When the marriage between the Free Church of Scotland and the late so called Covenanting Church of that country was consum-

mated, Dr. Goold, we are told, exhibited, or waved a "banner" in the presence of the Assembly. I have no doubt but that the banner exhibited was a genuine old banner of the Covenanters; but let me tell Dr. Goold that he exhibited a **STOLEN** banner, stolen from the arsenal of the brave! If that dumb banner had had a voice, it would have uttered a shriek, loud and piercing as that of a violated Bulgarian female, which would have caused the knees of the man who waved it to smite against each other; and that shriek, if put into words, would have read thus:—"Oh, murder! oh, desecration!! I am waved by the hands of a man who holds one of the very principles which put to death every hero over whom I waved in the days of old; he holds that man may swear to support immorality and tyranny, till immorality and tyranny may be removed!!"

Not so spoke the immortal "lassie" who "died for the Covenant." Dr. Goold has been of late throwing down "the gage of battle" to all sorts of people, challenging them to show wherein he has resiled from a single Covenanting principle. Now, Dr. Goold allows me to take up your "gage of battle," and to present you with a champion. The champion to whom I present you, is a *dead* champion; but, although dead, she yet speaketh. Yonder she lies, with dishevelled hair, just done to death by Prelatic tyranny, on the sea shore of Blednoch. Margaret Wilson, of Glenvernock, in the Shire of Galloway, wilt thou say, "God save the King?" Hear what the dead lips speak:—"I wish the salvation of all men, but the damnation of none; but, inasmuch as the Oath of Allegiance is an acknowledgment of the blasphemous supremacy of the Crown, I *will not* say, 'God save the King.' Let me go, let me go; anything: anywhere; bury me deep in the dark blue sea; but don't ask *me* to swear to support tyranny and immorality, till tyranny and immorality may be removed!" Let us now hear Dr. Goold:—"I do solemnly swear that I 'will maintain and support these several systems in the enjoyment of the rights and privileges to which, by law, they are entitled,' namely, semi-Popish Pre-

lacy in England ; Popery in Lower Canada and Malta ; and Paganism in Hindostan ; and this I swear on the true faith of a Christian." O, fie, fie, for shame, Dr. Goold ! You could not surely have the audacity to claim any ecclesiastical kinship with Margaret Wilson, after swearing such a horrible, Ashantee-Fetish oath, as this would be !

FEAR GOD. HONOUR THE KING.

To be sure, " Fear God. Honour the King ! " Are we not commanded to do so ? In truth, there is no Christian man who can refuse to render obedience to this Divine injunction, *in the sense in which it is uttered*. But is it, let me ask, to " fear God and honour the King," to deliberately swear to support semi-Popish Prelacy in England, together with the Erastian Headship of the Crown, " the power and places of Churchmen," and all the Popish errors in the Church of England Liturgy ; to swear to support the Erastianism that binds the Church of Scotland as a bond-slave to the State ; to swear to support the " five bastard Sacraments " of the Church of Rome in Lower Canada and Malta, together with the worship of the Virgin Mary and all " the Saints,"—not forgetting the old-air polluting " Baked Monks of Malta ; " to swear to support the bloody worship of Shiva, Durga, Kali, and Juggernath, in India : is *this*, I ask, to " fear God and honour the King ? " I say it is not :—on the contrary, I assert that it is,—practically at least,—to fear the " Beast " and to honour the " Beast."

A LOGICAL LABYRINTH AND THE LAST REFUGE REMOVED.

I venture to assert, that the *positive*, legal, and Scriptural arguments, brought forward by Rev. William Anderson, in his work, " The claims of the Divine Government," &c., and my *negative* arguments,—which, I believe are also highly positive,—form a logical and Scriptural LABYRINTH, out of which no human being can escape unless by one of two ways. If a man be a real admirer of the British Constitution,—and

such a man I never met with,—he may, with something like a good conscience, swear the Oath of Allegiance, and live, and fight, and die for the Constitution :—this is one way of breaking through our labyrinth. The only other possible way of getting out of the labyrinth is, in the way of taking a position of DISSENT AND PROTEST with regard to the Constitution :—a position of dissent and protest, not with regard to the Queen, as a woman ; not with regard to the Lords and Commons as men ; not with regard to any beneficent acts of legislation ; not with regard to our admirable *framework* of government ; not with regard to anything implied in good government *per se*, not with regard to whatever may be for the good of our fellow-countrymen ; but, with regard to the Popery, Prelacy, and Erastianism, which are enshrined in the Constitution,—yes, which constitute its very essence or being.

As a *last refuge* for those who swear the Oath of Allegiance, some there are who assert that the Oath of Allegiance has no reference, or at least, no definite reference, to the Constitution at all ! According to the view alluded to, the Oath of Allegiance simply asserts that Queen Victoria is the lawful Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland. This assertion, however, is untrue and perfectly absurd. No matter how often a man might swear that Queen Victoria is the lawful Sovereign of Britain, he never would, by so doing, swear the Oath of Allegiance, any more than he would swear the Oath of Allegiance to the Italian Government, by swearing that Victor Emmanuel is the lawful King of Italy. The Oath of Allegiance is taken to Queen Victoria, not as a woman, but as a queen ; and Queen Victoria is queen in no other way than as she is Head of the Constitution. The notion of a mere abstract oath, an oath to nothing at all,—a sort of Mahomet's-coffin oath,—is an idea so monstrously absurd that it cannot be too severely reprobated. Let us suppose the case of a man standing up to get married. The minister puts the question, “do you take this woman to be your lawful married wife,” and the man replies, “I swear that this is a *lawful* woman ;” now, what should we think of such a man ? Of course, the

minister would remind him that he must say "wife," not "woman." The man, then says, "I swear that this is a lawful wife." "That will not do either," the minister would reply; "you must say 'my,' not 'a.' Now, suppose that at this moment, a number of the man's friends, with a notary-public, should appear on the scene, with the statement that they are prepared to prove that the woman to whom the man was about to get married, was a notorious whore, liar, and thief. Proof of the charge is stated; and the minister now asks if the man is prepared to take the whore, liar and thief to be his lawful wife. Of course, the man would say that he would have nothing to do with such a woman. Now, I ask this emphatic question:—*why* is it that the moral nature of the man would rise up in rebellion against the very thought of marrying a whore, a liar and a thief? If a person holding the views of Rev. Mr. Key or Dr. Goold, had been present, he would have been *compelled*, by his principles, to say to the man, "my friend, don't be afraid to marry this woman; your vow or oath will not cover or homologate her whoredom, lying or thieving; it will only homologate her body, soul and spirit; and even though she should continue to play the whore, liar and thief, what matter?—your oath is a mere abstract thing, and has no reference to her wickedness at all." But, ah; nature, reason, and morality would assert their power, and the man would indignantly exclaim, "avaunt, thou quibbling sophist! I shall have nothing to do with your abstract swearing."

Now, it is a most undoubted fact, that, spiritually considered, the British Constitution is a notorious whore, liar and thief. For above two hundred years Britain has committed spiritual fornication with the Mother of harlots. Again and again has she shed torrents of blood and expended millions of money in defence of the Popish powers of the Continent; more than once has she aided in restoring the Pope to his throne; and the Pope and the Turk seem, at all times, to have been her especial favourites. Britain stands forth also as a liar, yea, a perjurer also, for she has broken cove-

nant with God, and trampled upon the whole work of the Covenanted Reformation. The British Constitution is also a thief, for it has stolen the whole Regalia of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is as clear, therefore, as any moral proposition can be, that the man who swears the Oath of Allegiance, either personally or by representation,—no matter in what *sense* the oath may be taken,—“covers” or “homologates” the whole of the iniquities of the Constitution.

NATURAL ALLEGIANCE.

When we look into the writings of those who are called constitutional lawyers, we find that a great deal is made by these writers, of what is called *natural Allegiance*. The principle held by the authors alluded to, is this, namely, that there is an original and implicit allegiance, owing from every subject to his Sovereign, antecedently to any express promise or oath; that every native-born subject owes allegiance to the civil power, just as much before, or without, taking an oath, as he does after taking an oath; and that, in fact, no native-born subject of a kingdom can throw off his allegiance, do what he will or go where he will. Now, if we attach a right meaning to the above definition of *natural Allegiance*, I have little fault to find with it:—but this is one of those cases in which the *meaning* is THE ALL. The Constitutional lawyers, I find, have taken right good care not to define what natural Allegiance is; but their strange omission,—which I am quite certain was intentional,—I shall supply. Natural Allegiance, then, is as follows:—“To go to bed at night; rise in the morning and take our meat and drink, with thankful hearts; to act well our part in whatever station in life God may have placed us, whether as farmers, shopmen, clerks, legislators, or ministers of the Gospel; to do whatever is implied in good government *per se*, even under a bad Constitution; to aim at being Howards for benevolence and Paysons for piety; and to fear God and honour the King, in the true sense of this Divine injunction;—this, I say, and nothing but this, is true natural Allegiance.

Now, although the Constitutional lawyers have given us no regular definition of natural Allegiance, yet, I fancy that I can make out the following two points from some of their writings—the first point refers to a *belief*, and the second to an *action*. Following the spirit of the Reformed Roman jurisprudence, effected by Tribonian, during the reign of Justinian I., Emperor of the East, the great mass of the earlier Constitutional lawyers of Europe seem to teach, as a regular dogma of faith, that all the men, women, and children throughout the whole of Europe, should believe that they were born to be rabbits or hares, in the rabbit-warrens of “the Pope and the Emperor,” to be hunted to death, at will, by the civil and ecclesiastical hell-dogs of tyranny! So much for the *belief*; and now for the *action*. In plain terms, then, the Constitutional lawyers have taught, and do still teach, that man—the timid rabbit and trembling hare—is bound, bound by the very necessity of his birth, to swear whatever Anti-Christian Oath of Allegiance those in power may impose or, else man, the timid rabbit and trembling hare, must “incarnerdine” the earth with his blood—the poor rabbit *must die*!! Yes, I say, “must die;” because, for refusing to submit to iniquitous Acts of Uniformity, and to swear iniquitous Oaths of Allegiance, untold millions of the human family have actually died.

The Seven Electors, who occupied the chief place in the Empire of the West, choose a Chief for the *Holy Roman Empire*, no more; the *golden bull*, the wondrous charter of the empire, has lost its ancient magic power; and when the Great Napoleon assumed the titles of Emperor of the French and King of Italy, Francis of Austria declared that the Imperial Constitution—after having lasted full one thousand years,—was at end. But, although there is now no civil head of the Holy Roman Empire, and although the Pope, the spiritual head thereof, is, I trust, on his last legs; yet, I am free to assert, that every Constitution in Europe is still Anti-Christian. I assert that the doctrine, even of modern Constitutional lawyers, with regard to natural Allegiance, is

purely Antichristian and Beastly. Divesting the subject of all mere technicalities, the doctrine of the Constitutional lawyers is, that in whatever country a man may be born, that man is bound by the fact of his being born in that country, to swear whatever Oath of Allegiance the majority may impose; and that he is bound to do so under pain of one or all of the following penalties,—namely, DEATH, as under the reign of the Pope and the Emperor; fine, imprisonment, banishment or expatriation, as witness the Pilgrim Fathers; or to be excluded politically considered, from all the markets and fairs of the world,—for no man, even now, can “buy or sell,” save the man who has the “mark of the beast,”—and to be branded with the opprobrious name of *rebel*! Now, I maintain that the whole of this doctrine is false; that it is a lie; a most monstrous and horrible lie; yes, a most fearful and hideous lie, and a blasphemy against God and poor humanity! Were this barbaric doctrine of the lawyers true, then, indeed, might it be said of that night in which a man child is born, “Lo, let that night be solitary, let no joyful voice come therein;” because with his very birth, and while he lies upon his mother’s bosom, imbibing the stream of life from the fountain of love, the young immortal is, somehow or other, covered with a horrible iron mask that can never, never be cast away; he is clothed upon with the dreadful shirt of Nessus, that can never, never be removed, but must stick to him, and perish with him only in the grave! Get ye gone, ye Constitutional lawyers! I tell ye once again, that your doctrine is a lie! I tell ye that WHAT IS MORALLY AND SCRIPTURALLY WRONG, CAN NEVER BE POLITICALLY RIGHT. I assert, that no man can ever be under any necessity, either by birth or otherwise, to swear an immoral oath; and I affirm that the man who refuses to swear an immoral Oath of Allegiance, is the true loyal man; and that the immoral Constitution and its friends, are the traitors and the rebels!

“O, but,” say the Constitutional lawyers, “if you live in the land at all; if you hold one inch of property,” own “a single acre of the soil,” &c., &c., you *can’t help* being loyal;

by living in the land, and holding any property at all, you do the very same thing as if you were to swear the Oath of Allegiance. This is another horrible falsehood!! The Apostle Paul had not the slightest notion of going "out of the world" because there were "fornicators," "covetous persons," "extortioners," and "idolators" in the world; neither have Covenanters the least idea of going to Timbuctoo, in order to please the Beast, Dr. Goold, and the Constitutional lawyers. The Apostle Paul was a free-born Roman citizen, and if this barbaric doctrine,—of all men, from their very birth, being shrouded in some sort of a horrible cloak of darkness, so that they could not help swearing, or doing what is the same as swearing, whatever oath, be it right or wrong, a nation may set up,—if this doctrine were really true, how comes it that we read nothing of it in the case of Paul? I do not know if a Constitutional lawyer would call a "hired house" an "inch of property;" if he does, we know that Paul had a "hired house;" if he does not, we know that Paul "lived" under the Roman government; now, my question is this, was Paul's living in the land, as a free-born citizen, under the Roman government, the *very same thing* as if Paul had sworn an oath to support the cruel and lascivious idolatry of Pagan Rome? Again; do Dr. Goold and the Constitutional lawyers believe, that under any circumstances whatever, Paul would ever have consented to swear to maintain the worship of Diana, Mars, Venus, Juno, and Jupiter? Now, gentlemen, out with your answer? Ha, ha! You will answer me when that much-spoken of era shall have arrived, to wit, Tibb's Eve! Paul lived under the Pagan Roman Empire, but he did not thereby homologate the Paganism of that Empire; Covenanters live under the British Constitution, but they do not thereby homologate the evils of that Constitution. Covenanters have not the slightest notion of allowing the Beast to push them out of this beautiful world, with its sunshine and its flowers; not at all! On the contrary, one of the objects the R. P. Church has in view, in taking up a posi-

tion of dissent and protest with regard to the British Constitution is, to drive the Beast out of the Constitution, out of Britain, out of Europe, out of the world. To live in the land, and to do whatever is implied in good citizenship and in good government *per se*, is not to homologate the evils of the Constitution ; but to swear the Oath of Allegiance, is voluntarily to assume THE MARK OF THE BEAST. Had the *some-time* Covenanters in Scotland kept this distinction in view, they would not have ignominiously struck their colours to the foe, and drooped the immortal old BLUE BANNER, borne for ages by the bravest of the brave, to the hideous black rag, with its death's head and cross-bones, and marked with the inscription,—THE MARK, THE NUMBER, AND THE NAME OF THE BEAST !!

A GRAND, MORAL, SPIRITUAL, SANQUHAR, REQUIRED,

But what, pray, was done at Sanquhar? Why, in that little Scottish town, the noblest deed was done—leaving out of view Scripture history—ever recorded, perhaps, in the annals of the world! On the morning of June 22nd, 1680, twenty horsemen, headed by Richard Cameron, entered the town of Sanquhar, and read and nailed to the market-cross, a declaration setting forth that Charles II. had forfeited his right to the Crown, and declaring war against him. Now, what was going on in Scotland, at the very hour when these noble “heroes of mighty bone and bold emprise,” dashed into Sanquhar? Why, Scotland was then “a field of blood!” Cruel men were cutting the heart from out the living man, and waving it “as a flag is waved upon the battle's van.” Young mothers were dropping scalding tears on the faces of their babes for the hands and the heads of the fathers of these babes, were sticking up on the spires of the gloomy towers of the tyrant. The very streams of “bonnie Scotland” were tinged with blood; the curlew, unable to find its quiet, accustomed marshy bed, was screaming wildly through the heavens; and the restless plover was uttering its little cry.

Now, in the midst of all this scene of horror, Cameron and his companions, being determined to endure the tyrant no longer, nailed their colours to the mast, *and declared war against him!* “O, but these men went too far,” said the Indulged! “O, these men went quite too far,” says the carpet knight, still, as he lounges in his easy chair, with his slippers upon the fender. Well, yes indeed, they did go *far*:—they went that *far* that they hurled the bloody house of Stuart from the throne, and brought William, Prince of Orange, to Torbay. They went that far that they kindled up a beacon-light in Sanquhar, whose ruddy blaze has flashed over the Three Kingdoms and throughout the world, and which has obtained for us the light and liberty we now enjoy! They went that far that they brought down “fire” from God out of Heaven, which hath devoured their enemies; “fire,” which hath been scattered upon the seat of the Beast, so that the Kingdom of the Beast hath been filled with darkness, and men have gnawed their tongues for pain; fire, which hath revolutionised kingdoms, consumed thrones, sceptres, and crowns; and fire, too, which we trust, hath rendered it utterly impossible for any future despot to cut the heart, for conscience sake, from out the living man! Ah, how can the man who sits snuggling in his well-furnished house, purchased for him, in fact, by the blood and tears of martyrs, find in his little heartless heart to say that the men of Sanquhar went too far? No, they did not go too far. What saith the eloquent Baptist minister, Rev. W. Landels, in his lecture in Exeter Hall, London, on “The Scottish Covenanters.” of the deed done at Sanquhar? Thus he speaks:—“Not rash, then. No. Let us gratefully acknowledge it. *It was the right thing to do.* England, for centuries past, has reaped—you and I this night are reaping—communities of Free Englishmen in all parts of the world are reaping—ay, and successive generations will yet rise up to reap, the benefits of that act of heroism.”

Now, reader, bear in recollection, that the Act of Uniformity that murdered every martyr who perished in Scotland,

IS NOW THE LAW OF THE LAND, UNCHANGED, UNREPEALED!! Chained in, it is, I grant, as a monstrous wild beast, by the Toleration Act; but let a single link of the chain be broken, and then we are, *ipso facto*, launched out into as dreadful a persecution as any that ever raged since the days of Diocletian! Such being the case, of course, to ask a Covenanter to swear the Oath of Allegiance, is just the very same as if one were to ask a son to bow down and kiss the bloody hands of the murderer of his father! Do we not, then, require a grand, moral, spiritual Sanquhar? Most certainly, we do! What our country now requires is—not men of plastic minds who, “for their own private ends, *construct* interpretations” of the Oath of Allegiance—but men who shall stand up against the whole Anti-christian system, and Sanquhar-like, proclaim open, moral, spiritual war, against the Popery, Prelacy, and Erastianism that are enshrined in the Constitution!

VISION OF FUTURITY.

Methinks I see a vision of futurity. Far up the craggy heights of time, that overlook the plains of Armageddon, I see a noble, patriot, Christian youth, bearing in his hand a banner. Methinks I hear his loud “Excelsior;” his last “farewell” to tyranny; his last “adieu” to Popery, Prelacy, and Erastianism; his last “good night” to Antichristian legislation. And, as he ascends still higher up the heights, guided by “the mystic lights that shone upon the gems of Israel’s pontiff,” I see him, ’midst the wreck of thrones and the crash of the tumbling towers of mystical Babylon, wave, right manfully, his banner; and I hear his clear manly cry—as of some bless’d voice uttering joy—and that cry is,—UP, UP, UP; HIGHER, HIGHER, HIGHER; UP WITH THE IMMORTAL OLD BANNER OF THE BLUE!